	M5B5speS	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V.	21 Cr. 116 (LAK)
5	JEREMY SPENCER,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		May 11, 2022 4:05 p.m.
9		1100 P.IIII
10	Before:	
11	HON. LEWIS A. KAPLAN,	
12		U.S. District Judge
13		
14	APPEARANCES	
15	DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the	
16	Southern District of New York BY: CHRISTINE I. MAGDO Assistant United States Attorney	
17		
18	FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant BY: SYLVIE J. LEVINE NEIL P. KELLY ALSO PRESENT: BRANDON RACZ, Special Agent, FBI	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
II		

M5B5speS (Case called) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Government, are you ready? MS. MAGDO: Yes. Assistant U.S. Attorney Christine Magdo for the government. With me at counsel table is FBI Special Agent Brandon Racz. Good afternoon. THE COURT: Good afternoon. THE DEPUTY CLERK: Defendant, are you ready? MS. LEVINE: Yes. Thank you. Good afternoon, your Honor. The Federal Defenders of New York by Sylvie Levine and Neil Kelly, on behalf of Mr. Jeremy Spence. THE COURT: Ms. Levine, have you and your client had the report for the necessary period? MS. LEVINE: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Mr. Spence, have you read the presentence report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And not meaning to be flip, have you read every word of it?

THE DEFENDANT: I have.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it fully with

Ms. Levine?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: The presentence report will be sealed and made available to counsel in the event of an appeal.

Now, I have noted one great big error in the

presentence report in paragraph 6(a)(3) where it says the loss amount was greater than \$150,000 but not greater than \$350,000. Those figures are wrong. The loss amount is greater than \$1,500,000 but not greater than \$3.5 million and I will make that correction.

Are there any other unresolved objections to the presentence report?

MS. MAGDO: Not from the government.

THE COURT: Ms. Levine?

MS. LEVINE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I adopt the presentence report and the guideline computation and range that it contains.

Now, for the sake of good order I have received, in relation to the sentencing: The presentence report; a proposed consent order of restitution; a letter from Ms. Levine dated May 9th; victim impact statements under a cover letter from the U.S. Attorney's office from Craig Young, Maurice Martinez. I have received a sentencing memorandum from the government that was filed on May the 6th, to which there is a small pile of attachments and an extensive sentencing memorandum from Ms. Levine dated the 29th of April.

Is there anything else of which I ought to be aware?

Ms. Magdo?

MS. MAGDO: Not from the government. Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Ms. Levine. 2 MS. LEVINE: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Now, I gather there are 4 victims of this crime who want to be heard on sentencing; am I 5 right? 6 Yes, your Honor; there are two. MS. MAGDO: 7 THE COURT: All right. And they are? 8 MS. MAGDO: They are Mr. Jeremy Lee and Mr. Daniel 9 Truque. 10 THE COURT: Is it Mr. Reed? Was that the first name? 11 MS. MAGDO: Lee, L-E-E. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Lee, you can come to the lectern here, 13 and as long as you are at the lectern you can take off your 14 mask, and I am happy to hear what have you to say. 15 MR. LEE: Thank you, your Honor. So I am just going 16 to read my statement: 17 I, like many other people, met Jeremy Spence online. 18 He had been placing trades and seemed to have potential in 19 terms of calling --20 THE COURT: I am going to have to ask you to go a lot 21 slower because my old ears are no longer as quick as they used 22 to be. MR. LEE: Sure. 23 I, like many other people, met Jeremy online. He had 24 25 been posting trades and he seemed to have potential as a

trader. He was calling trades before they happened and he became pretty famous, pretty quickly, online. I started to get a following and I was excited about interacting with him. The crypto markets were brand-new, not a lot of institutional traders were in that environment and so it was really kind of the wild west, so to find someone who could navigate that environment with the complexity of it was exciting. I initially wanted to learn from him and, you know, very instantly I saw that he was an introverted guy and so I wanted to help connect him with other people.

My background is in technology. I moved into fintech just a few years ago, I moved up from Texas to New York and I amassed a pretty large network of pretty influential people in both the stock market and crypto world.

I made it a strong priority to help him. I went out of my way, spent a lot of time to help him so that he would not put himself in a bad situation. Crypto acted like it was not going to apply to the real world in terms of SEC laws. I heard from people that I was very connected with that that was not true and every bit of advice that I gave him was to keep him as protected as anyone in the crypto world.

So when I did meet him, I was surprised that he was very young, very introverted, and he did not have a lot of professional experience. So I went ahead and started to put him in touch with those people, one of which is Dan who is

here.

Sorry, I'm catching up here.

So once I started talk to him and met him in person, he seemed quite excited about the opportunities in terms of the network that I put him in touch with. We decided very early on that what he was doing with these retail traders of which he was keeping a mask on — he would not tell us — but what he was doing was very large and he was taking in a lot of money. And once we found out about that we told him that he could not do that. And so, we went and set up a hedge fund for him. It's not cheap, it's not easy. We did all of this for him. We hired fund administrators. We did a lot of work. I went out of my way to learn the laws just so he wouldn't get in trouble.

So time and time again I made it very clear that he should not be taking money from people online and that he needed to stop trading for anyone that was not a sophisticated or accredited investor. Through every interaction he agreed and told us it was his intention to move forward with doing things the right way.

While waiting for this fund to be set up outside of our normal jobs, I had given him a significant amount of money to trade for me. I felt with my connections legally and professionally, we hooked him up — with this person was in a fund, a premiere patent attorney who works for Morgan Lewis. I mean, these are not small-time people. I felt with my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

connections legally and professionally that he understood the seriousness of handling this money so I felt it was safe. I did a background check on him and saw that he had nothing in his background.

One of my best friends was as excited about crypto and he wanted to set aside some money to invest. He did not have anybody to trade for him and he did not have time to trade. Не knew that I had money with Jeremy and he wanted to give him significant capital. I warned him of the risk and told him that there are many hedge funds now starting form in the crypto space and he should probably wait for that. He said that he wanted to meet Jeremy so he flew up to New York and he met him. And Jeremy assured him a hundred percent his money was safe. This, according to the last I talked to the FBI, was after he was already losing money. He posted fake returns of significant amounts of capital and took \$800,000 from one of my best friends. Come to find out, at least from what I understand, he never invested any of Peter's money, he turned around and started paying other people.

So at the end of the year, tax season comes around. We gave him tax advice. Peter needed his money for taxes. I went through four days of spending 12 hours on the phone with this dude. And lie, lie, lie, lie, lie. I don't know if he had the money. I don't know what he did with the money at that point. I was on the phone all night with him, extremely

stressful. At that point my buddy was in Europe. I had to call him overnight and I had to tell him I don't think you're going to get your money back. Not a fun call.

At that point I found out the FBI was looking into him and he started to pull away from me and stopped talking. At the same time, he got an attorney and before he fully pulled away he kept telling me, oh, it's going to be fine. It's going to be fine. Just lying, every word that came out of his mouth.

So at the end of it, the last time I spoke to him he told me still, Peter's money was safe, it was in a different fund. He also told me it was his express purpose to subvert law enforcement and to subvert the court system by hiding BitCoin and if he were to go to jail, that he is going to hide money and that when he gets out, he is going to leave the United States and he is going to live like a king with all that money because BitCoin has gone up a ton. And when I talked to the FBI, they said they don't think that's the case.

It is not that difficult to wash money in the crypto space. I do not have any confidence -- no offense to the FBI or anything -- but I did look at it, it is my expectation that it was his express purpose to subvert the law and that is still his purpose.

So it is very important for me to know that he could not have had better humans around to help him. I spent a ton of effort. I coached him on the importance of honesty,

integrity, building things the right way, surrounding yourself with good people. I introduced him to extreme professionals.

We set up a fund. We spent money to set up that fund.

So this was not an innocent mistake on his part. It was willful. He had every opportunity to do the right thing and he not only made mistakes but willfully stole a million dollars from one of the nicest people I have ever met. His actions have significantly damaged close relationships in my life, it has damaged my professional reputation, it has damaged my savings, and if he was at all responsible with my funds, I would have a lot more money right know if he had just held it, if he just didn't lie about it.

So most importantly, he took advantage of people that reached out to try and help him on their own time that are good people. So based on Jeremy's willful, consistent lies, and pattern of fraud, I would expect that the Court take very seriously what he has done and that this is not just some young kid who didn't know what he was doing. He had hundreds of opportunities to do the right thing. He lied at every step of the way and he never once chose to do the right thing.

So I would appreciate it if this is factored into sentencing and I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The next victim witness is?

MS. MAGDO: Mr. Daniel Truque.

THE COURT: Please come up, sir. You may proceed.

MR. TRUQUE: Thank you.

Just to give you some background, I have been in finance for over 15 years now. I started my career at McKenzie working for the risk management practice during the financial crisis so helping financial institutions gracefully implode or evolve from hairy situations. So I have had a long background in terms of regulation and how to do things properly in the financial arena. I did work for HSBC Bank, this was during the time after 2008 where you had all the additional compliance relations, etc., and that ginormous burden that the banks had to deal with to avoid another implosion. I have taken multiple Financial Series licensing exams.

So what I am trying to tell you is that I know the regulations, I know how these things work. On top of that, I worked at both Bridgewater and AQR Capital. Bridgewater and AQR are the two largest quantitative hedge funds in the world, they both manage close to a trillion dollars each. I have experience on how to do this.

When Jeremy came to me -- and just to distinguish here, when I mention "Jeremy" I am talking about Jeremy Lee. Jeremy Spence I'm going to refer to as Little Jeremy, that's what we refer to just him to differentiate, so that way there is no confusion there.

I met Little Jeremy in early 2018, like many of his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

victims, through word of mouth; in this case through my friend Jeremy. His alleged returns were impressive. I had already fallen for the crypto fever like many others. Questions that many of you may ask is why trust a kid in college still trading the crypto markets? The crypto markets are heavily inefficient. They are new markets, they are driven a lot by sentiment and by community, and if you have somebody like Little Jeremy that can spend -- glued to their monitor 24 hours a day to understand what people are talking about, it was very feasible that somebody in his position and with the connections that he had, call it in the cryptosphere, he could actually be able to foresee or predict the movements in the markets. is not that we just jumped blindly into something. As my friend Jeremy mentioned, he had seen how Little Jeremy's reputation online was growing and how he was accurately predicting different market moves ahead of time.

So after meeting with him and explaining to him my background, I told him two very clear things: The way you are managing funds in your personal account is illegal; and number two, I can help you become a successful fund manager which is what you are aiming to be. He loved the idea, he seemed eager to create a new fund. And, alongside Jeremy, we went ahead, hired lawyers, and created the golden standard of hedge fund structures which is a Cayman Islands based master fund with a Cayman Islander Feeder Fund and a Delaware Feeder Fund. These

are the golden standard of hedge funds. Traditional hedge funds use this and so we are separating the interest of onshore investors and offshore investors in terms of sophistication.

There is cheaper ways of building a fund but this is the way to do it if, in the future, you want to attract institutional capital and sophisticated investors. We took care of researching not only the legal but also, as my friend Jeremy mentioned earlier, looking at different fund admin relationships, the auditors, the banking requirements, etc. We had all of that in mind.

While the necessary entities on paperwork were created and to avoid missing out on the returns, I gave him some money to manage for me. I told him I would not pay for performance because that was flat out illegal. Also, even though there was not a formal contract or guarantee between him and I, I calculated that he would not bite the hand that would make him into a bigtime hedge fund manager. I saw a lot of potential in him — and I was wrong.

Less than a year later, he never returned the more than 20 BitCoins I gave him, which are worth today close to \$1 million. And that is despite BitCoin Prices having dropped recently over 50 percent so let's keep that clear. The money that I gave him would have been worth way over a million dollars today.

At some point the assets, the digital assets that he

was managing, were worth well over \$10 million. I understand the Court only looked at the dollar value but, let's be clear, the digital asset space is more than established by now, these assets have a value, and at some point he was managing over \$10 million that suddenly, somehow, disappeared.

Again, I am here with Jeremy my friend in the idea that I don't think that money disappeared. That money is somewhere and Little Jeremy had mentioned very clearly that if he ever got into trouble, he would simply hide the money. Whether that is realistic or not in today's day and age where all the wallets can be traced fairly closely and we have seen examples of past hacks where the money comes up, that was his intention. And I don't know whether the — how much reach the FBI has into researching this but, again, that was his intentions and I believe that there is probably, very likely, still some crypto currency stashed away for him to get it out and enjoy it in the future and have his great payday while the more than a hundred victims are still here lamenting what happened back then.

There was a guy on the west coast in California, he actually gave him money that — it was a bad idea, but money that he was supposed to use to pay for his college loans.

There was another guy in Florida that was the one actually setting up the box that he created on this online chat application where they could show automated reports — all of

these reports were fed by data that he gave. So a lot of people helped him set up stuff and he was just using everybody and fabricating reports.

I had been very clear with him from the start and throughout the few months that I interacted with him telling him many times what you are doing is illegal. He insisted on continuing to trade while we finished setting up the fund. I told him there were legal ways to do this but, most importantly, he could not charge a management fee in the meantime. Later I find out that he renamed that performance fee "a tip" in this online chat application where he would do the reports. I told him that a tip, if mandatory, is still illegal. It is not allowed. He ignored it. I went as far as to clarify in these words: A mandatory tip is still a performance fee and it is illegal. You cannot do this.

Then came the spring tax season. I warned him, you have to pay taxes on the trades that you have been doing because all of these digital assets you have been trading on your personal accounts. The IRS doesn't care that it is not your money. The IRS only cares that your accounts are trading crypto assets that should pay taxes. Set money aside to pay those taxes and when you return money and gains to your investors, you need to deduct those taxes. He never did. And I'm sure there is many other taxes that he didn't pay on top of that.

I highlighted the importance of having a formal hedge fund structure out of the Cayman Islands and the Delaware Feeder so that investors would be trustworthy of the golden standard of hedge funds. Again, he always said yes, yes, we are going to do this. I asked him several times to look at the list of his investors, figure out who were credit debts so they could be given subscription agreements for the new fund and then weed out and kick out any of the non-accredited investors who would not be eligible to invest in this type of fund. Again, the whole time he was thankful for the advice, always complimentary, and gave me lip service that didn't materialize into action.

Then came the summer. This is when things started getting bad. It was kind of, like, a weird time in my life, I actually got married in July of that year, 2018. I even invited Little Jeremy to my wedding celebration. In the end, he showed up late and apparently wasn't even wearing dress shoes and didn't get in. Or, maybe that is just the excuse that he gave me and he never showed up to the venue. But this is just to show how tight we were supposed to be back then and how badly he was misleading everybody who was trying to help him.

In the fall, my wife left for her NYU study abroad semester in Ghana. Meanwhile, I couldn't travel. I couldn't work because I was still processing the marriage-based Green

Card and my previous employment work visa had expired. So I was in a situation where I couldn't travel, I couldn't work, and I had no money. A lot of the money, I had given it to Jeremy. I was hoping to build a nest for me and my wife and, instead, he disappeared everything. What would have been something that would have given my wife and my future family security essentially disappeared thanks to his complete disregard for other people.

It was a dark period for me. I entered a period of depression and anxiety. I started to realize that Little

Jeremy was likely not going to return my money. The nest I built for my wife and me was gone. Worst of all, I was ashamed of sharing this to my wife -- with my wife. She depended on me for support while she was still pursuing her studies.

Naturally, I became with conserving cash, going as far as checking out the nut section at Duane Reade when they would be because they were a dense source of nutrition. I literally had no cash to, like, even pay rent. At some point I tried selling a couple of BitCoins that I had left to pay rent and, lo and behold, I got scammed online thanks to Chase Bank reversing a Zelle transaction which is supposed to be absolute but that's a story for another day.

Everything in my life seemed to be spiraling out of control and Little Jeremy, of course, stopped communicating with us -- most likely ashamed and most likely given advice

from his lawyers in terms of communicating with people in his "quote unquote" fund.

Make no mistake, Little Jeremy has nothing of little. He is young, sure; 20-something. But he is not done and certainly not naive. He is a master manipulator and cannot claim ignorance. He got plenty of good advice from experienced people. My advice alone would have prevented his current fate. He knew what he was doing, he willfully did what he did. He even once said that if he got in trouble, he would stash away crypto currency. I mentioned this before, I mention it again because it is something that is a key point of contempt for Jeremy and I, knowing that he likely will have that nest stashed away somewhere in the future.

In the end, I have actually coached other managers just like Little Jeremy was the first one, I have coached other managers. I am actually launching an FX trading fund by the end of the month. This is a fund that is already looking very promising, we already raised \$5 million from investors, credit investors with all the relevant bells and whistles required by law and regulation. There is three other managers in the pipeline for the rest of the year.

Jeremy Spence -- Little Jeremy sitting right there -he could have been one of them and he chose not to. He chose
to go the wrong way, he chose to go the illegal way. He chose
to ignore all the good advice that people with experience in

the industry gave to him.

And one last thing before I go. The fact -- I just heard Jeremy mentioning -- my friend Jeremy -- mention that the money his Peter, his other friend gave to Little Jeremy apparently was paid out to other investors that were cashing out. I don't need to have been in finance for 15 years to know that when you pay out your investors with money from other investors, it is what is usually described as a Ponzi scheme. So let's keep that clear. If he actually did that and he was actually not making returns, then this is even worse than it sounds.

That's all I have. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Levine.

MS. LEVINE: Thank you, your Honor.

Jeremy was 21 and then 22 years old when he committed this crime. He was an introverted college dropout who became enthralled with the burgeoning world of cryptocurrency, and in less than a year he got in way too fast and way too deep and he made loads of mistakes and he lied. He committed a federal crime and the whole thing crumbled around him, and that crumbling took place at the end of 2018 which is now three and a half years ago. And over the course of the last three and a half years, Jeremy has lived every single day with the consequences of his misdeeds.

His downfall was blasted across the crypto world. He was sued by the investors. There are civil judgments from this building that have been entered against him. He was sued by the CFTC. And, on a personal level, he left New York, he moved back in with his parents, he is completely reliant on them, and he is broke. He is at home. He sometimes mows lawns for money or does small graphic design jobs. His days in the online financial markets are completely behind him. Jeremy already lives with the total and utter failure of his venture into the cryptocurrency world every single day. And for his crime, he pled guilty to his first ever conviction, a federal felony, and I think that's where I have to start responding to something the victims just said which is the suggestion that he never once did the right thing.

Your Honor, pleading guilty was the right thing.

Pleading guilty was an important and necessary step towards

making amends for the crime that he did in fact commit. And he

has apologized for his actions. He did so in his letter to

your Honor. And in that letter he specifically apologizes to

the investors who had trusted him.

Now, this entire thing was ill-conceived from the beginning. Jeremy never should have been trading with so little expertise no matter how ambitious he was, or nerdy he was, or excited he was about crypto. He told your Honor in his letter it was poor decision-making to be in that world to begin

with, he was out of his depth. And so, the question we are all here to talk about today and the question that your Honor has to decide is all these years later is does he need more punishment and, if so, how much punishment is enough.

Now, Jeremy has never been to prison for a day in his life. He has never been on probation. He has never been on home detention. He has never been mandated to do community service. And we submit that there are many ways that this Court can punish and specifically deter Jeremy without requiring that he go to jail. And a guideline sentence, which is essentially five years, when Jeremy has never been to jail for so much as five hours, is vastly greater than necessary. It would be inconsistent with the 3553(a) factors and it would be inconsistent with the interests of justice.

Now, your Honor knows from our materials that this case marks Jeremy's first ever contact with the criminal justice system. Ever. He has zero criminal history points. And the statistics from the United States Sentencing Commission tell us that people with zero points — people like Jeremy — have the actual lowest rate of recidivism of anyone who comes with this system, even though lower than people with just one point even though they're in the same category. And I think the reason for this is that people who live law-abiding lives and then step off track for the first time don't need that much work to get back on track.

This whole experience from his arrest through today is designed to send a specific message to Jeremy, and others: Do not ever do anything like this again. And there is simply no question that Jeremy has heard that loud and clear. And again I say, there are lots of ways your Honor can drive that point home — put him on an ankle bracelet, lock him in his house, mandate community service, have him pay the community back for the wrongs that he has done, and of course by requiring restitution which Mr. Spence has agreed to, he signed a prospective restitution order, and that way he can work to pay off his victims. Jail is not necessary here and the numbers requested by the government are just vastly inappropriate and unjust.

Now, your Honor is well familiar and read in our letter and has read in other letters over the years the critique of the guideline section that applies here, 2B1.1, and I won't belabor it but beyond to say this: The Second Circuit, and many District Courts, have criticized the structure of this guideline because the way that 2B1.1 is written, the Sentencing Commission decided to make the base offense level low. It starts at six, and then it rises at a prodigious rate based solely on loss amount and at intervals that are larger than we see for weapons cases or for bodily injury cases, and in ways that the Second Circuit has specifically said are not empirically based. And here it is that loss amount enhancement

that changes Jeremy's guidelines from 6 to 12 months to 57 to 71 months. It is a perfect example of how this unjust guideline falls on folks. And so we ask your Honor to consider these arguments and not use this overblown guidelines range as a starting off point in this case.

Now I want to talk for a minute about both specific and general deterrence. The government, in their letter, said that Jeremy's public shaming — which of course they don't dispute — you can't Google his name without reading all about this — this public shaming accomplishes I think both specific and general deterrence. It is specific because it has, as I described at the beginning, long before any Court systems got involved, the crypto market — this online world — found out what happened, they publicized what happened. And as a practical matter, no one is ever giving Jeremy any money ever again to do anything with. He is out of the financial business for good. This whole thing has been life-changing for this 25-year-old.

And I think it is worth noting that in recommending a downward variance, the Probation Department specifically said we do not think specific jail time is necessary for specific deterrence. We believe that he has been specifically deterred already.

And so that leaves us, of course, with general deterrence. And this is kind of an interesting case because in

a lot of cases, I think general deterrence is kind of -- is more theoretical than it is actual because we don't know exactly who is learning about the outcome of any particular case. But in this case, because it all happened online, because it was all taking place in an online forum, his downfall was documented in great detail on online fora. In our papers I cited to many, many, many websites that tell the story of Jeremy's crime and its consequences. It was true when the fund collapsed, it was true when he was sued, it was true when got arrested. There has already been a bright shining warning to that community that you shall not and should not engage in the same mistakes that Jeremy did.

Now I want to talk a little bit about the context in which this offense was committed and I am going to agree with something that Mr. Lee said which is the crypto world, particularly back in 2017 and 2018 when Jeremy was trading, I had written in my notes the wild west, which is exactly what Mr. Lee said. It is nothing like the traditional financial markets.

Traditional financial markets have gatekeepers.

Right? You usually need credentials for people to invest lots and lots of money with you but here, no such thing existed.

Investments were made from one anonymous online screen name to another anonymous online screen name in a world of chat boxes and expletives and no capitalization. People were extremely

eager to break into this world. I think one of the victims just called it "crypto fever." And people -- smart people, sophisticated people -- were desperate to break into these online markets. And they sent Jeremy money and many of the investors didn't even know him as Jeremy, they knew him as a cartoon avatar of an igloo. And I will share with your Honor that I called it an igloo in my papers. Jeremy corrected me that it is a picture of a whale. But that's the point, it was a hard-to-see cartoon that they were investing their savings with.

THE COURT: Is it still possible for somebody to do that now?

MS. LEVINE: That's a good -- so I -- it is probably a better question for the FBI but, as I understand it, there has been more regulation brought into these markets than there was then. I think you can invest money via the Internet, like I think people are able to, but I do think that regulation has advanced in the forum. At the time Jeremy was doing it there was none, as I understand it.

THE COURT: That doesn't help answer my question.

MS. LEVINE: I guess I don't really know the answer to your question.

THE COURT: So there is no way I can have total confidence that six months or a year from now this defendant doesn't invent a new avatar and stick it on the web and start

doing this all over again. Right?

MS. LEVINE: So I guess -- I guess not -- no, there would be nothing stopping him. However, I guess there are things that would stop him, here is what they are. The first is I think that Jeremy is an entirely different place in his life than he was in 2017, not least of all now having been prosecuted fully and admitted to a federal felony. Right? This whole process is supposed to teach people lessons and we have no reason to think he hasn't learned his lesson loud and clear.

Second, you have the last 15 months of Jeremy -- the last 15 months of full compliance with pretrial release and with the FBI knowing a whole lot about Jeremy, they know a lot about his finances. They are well-acquainted with him and there has been absolutely no hint that he has so much as logged onto any of these online fora and done anything there.

And then, of course, the future is different than the past because when Jeremy is placed on supervision, which he will be in any sentence your Honor gives, your Honor can mandate that the probation office be given access to his online devices. The Probation Department here can literally monitor that behavior to prevent it from happening. Your Honor can also add additional --

THE COURT: If they know the universe of devices, yes?

MS. LEVINE: That's correct. But there is absolutely

nothing in Jeremy's history, to date, of hiding — once this case started there have just been no incidents. Your Honor and I both see lots of cases where during pretrial supervision we see people re-offend, we see people relapse, we see people hide things, we see people have secret devices. There has been no such allegation in this case and I submit to you it is because he is broke and living under the roof of his parents. This is not someone who is out in the world in the same position as he was before. So I think there is absolutely no indication of relapse, there is no indication of repeated behavior. And your Honor has three and a half years to look back at. The FBI was very, very, very involved in Jeremy's devices, account numbers, account names. They know everything about him and in three and a half years, there is no suggestion that he has done such a thing.

THE COURT: They know everything about him except what they don't know.

MS. LEVINE: Well, I suppose that's true but they've done a lot of legwork and this is not a person who was particularly sophisticated, he is not a person who -- I mean, I think we all agree -- the victims, FBI, and I -- all agree that this was a young kid who got in too fast. He doesn't have the kind of sophisticated Cayman Islands hedge fund connections that even the victims have. He just didn't have such things. And I know the victims say they tried to give him those things

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that it was pretty much an utter failure because he was sitting alone behind his laptop clicking buttons. He just didn't have the wherewithal for such additional bad acts.

And so, it is really hard when you read the discovery in this case. It is almost hard to believe, even though I know fully what he is charged with -- and I don't know anything about cryptocurrency -- but you read the discovery in this case and it is almost hard to believe that, like, one chat avatar that is a picture of a rodent who is using, like expletives and lower case letters to another avatar that's a picture of a whale, and they have names like Bruce Halftroll, and Jeremy is posting things like "invest in this squiggly line," and "just kidding, I suck," that in that world it's almost hard to believe that that's a real financial market. And of course it was, I'm not disputing that it was, but I really do believe that a kid -- a 21-year-old college dropout who got kind of wrapped up in this in the way that social media wraps people up, it would have been really, really hard to appreciate how unregulated, how in such an unregulated, anonymous world how the -- like how those consequences would translate to real life. And of course Jeremy didn't think those things through and that's why he is here but he absolutely has now.

There is no better way to teach somebody that this was not an online anonymous back and forth chat world than by having the FBI come to your house, by having a civil judgment

entered against you, by being on pretrial release for 15 months, and by pleading guilty in open court to a federal felony. That is how we intervene. It is how we teach Jeremy that he was wrong before. To suggest that none of those things have value or taught him anything or would stop him, I think, undervalues what we all do here every day.

And just to make one additional point about how unregulated and out-of-control these markets were, the place where most of the investor money was traded was on a platform that's called BitMEX. In the last few months the U.S. Attorney's office here in the Southern District of New York arrested the founders of BitMEX because the platform itself, it turned out, was illegal. The way they structured it was in violation of federal laws. And now those people have pled guilty and they're pending sentencing I think in front of Judge Koeltl.

So I say all of this to say back in 2017 and 2018 this new market, things were swirling around and people made a lot of mistakes but the government has stepped in, they've shut a lot of them down to your Honor's question, I guess, about doing it again. They have been, I think, trying very hard to bring regulation into these places. And so at least that platform, for example, is gone.

And to that end, despite how unreal it felt, despite how unregulated it was, Jeremy knows and completely accepts

that real people lost real money. There has never been any question about that. He has never disputed the restitution amount, he entered willingly into the restitution order, and this is also, I think, distinct from a lot of the fraud cases your Honor sees in this building in that the FBI — the government's narrative is not that Jeremy had a lavish lifestyle or stole the money and kept it or lined his pockets or used it for something in particular.

I heard both the victims today speculate that they think it is in some magical fund somewhere. It is not at every sentencing where I find myself in alignment with the FBI but the FBI has dug really deep and very thoroughly and I think they feel strongly — I have spent a lot of time on the phone with the agent and the prosecutor — that the money doesn't exist, it was lost in the markets, it was re—invested in the kind of chaos of the downfall of the fund and some of it was, as one of the victims just mentioned, some of it was — some of the money that came in was used to pay off other investors. That's part of the fraud here. But Jeremy doesn't have it. He is living alone in his parents' house, broke.

It is rare in a case I think that I would spend this much time talking about the victim statements both here in court and the ones that were submitted and we absolutely accept that the hardships incurred were real, but I do want to talk about some of the facts that I think it's part of my job to

talk about some of the facts in those letters that are salient to sentencing. And the first is this:

Jeremy did misrepresent his trading successes. But he really did not ever misrepresent who he was. He was a 21-year-old college dropout with no financial training. He didn't pretend to have gone to business school, he didn't claim he was 35 years old. He was a guy who was good at crypto trading on the Internet. And the investors knew exactly who they were dealing with. Mr. Lee said to your Honor the same thing he wrote in his letter: "When I met him, I was surprised to meet a very young, introverted trader, without a lot of professional experience." That's a completely accurate assessment. They knew who he was.

Second, many of the investors were older than Jeremy by at least a decade and they were far more sophisticated.

They were the ones with financial training and experience and McKenzie on their résumés. Jeremy was a philosophy major who got through six semesters at knew, NYU. And I think that that matters because there is this duality in the letters where on the one hand you have people like Mr. Truque saying we saw what he was doing, it was illegal, we told him it was illegal, we warned him it was illegal, but they were also giving him money to invest. And in Mr. Truque's letter he said, "It was with no formal contract or guarantee between him and I." I think that many of the victims, exactly like Jeremy, were just hoping this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was all going to work out. They were excited about cryptocurrency and everybody made a lot of mistakes. That world was too optimistic and too informal and too presumptuous but it wasn't exclusive to Jeremy.

THE COURT: And one person, from what I understand here, was lying about it.

MS. LEVINE: That's right. But I think that the lies in this case -- and he did do that. I have said so and your Honor is absolutely correct, but the lies were in the same vein of trying to make people money in this market. It wasn't so he could take tropical vacations. He was making investments, there is no question about it. The FBI agrees with that. He was doing it badly and then incentivizing people to give him more money based on false information and that's the crime. That's the crime. But it was to -- it was because he believed the hype, it is because everybody -- everybody -- thought crypto is going up, everyone is going to make money if we do this. And it was stupid and it was extremely naive. And in Jeremy's case, because of the misrepresentations, it was criminal but it was not -- it certainly didn't start as malicious, it started from trying to make real people real money.

THE COURT: But it certainly, at some point, got to be quite malicious, didn't it?

MS. LEVINE: So I think that's right but I still think

the outcome was quite malicious. I still think at no point did Jeremy think, man, I'm going to hurt these people. To the contrary. He thought, I'm overwhelmed, I'm filled with anxiety, I have no idea how to get out of this, and I am going to freak out and say whatever is the easiest thing to make people not be mad at me until tomorrow. And that's not really malice. It's thoughtless and it is stupid but it is not malice and I do believe there is an important line there that distinguishes Jeremy from a lot of other fraud cases that your Honor sees.

And there is just this whole world was just so risky. I heard the victims talk about the risks inherent in the crypto markets and I think we can't appreciate, I think unless maybe we were there doing it, the fever level of the crypto fever that had seized everyone. You know, these markets were being — like some of these online chat rooms, they're going 24 hours a day, people from all over the globe are chatting and posting and chatting and posting and I think it was a lot of wishful thinking and I think that a lot of people got carried away and Jeremy not only did those things, it was wishful thinking and carried away but also crossed the line. He crossed the line by posting false information and for that he is now a felon for the rest of his life.

But I will tell you that in reading all of the discovery in this case, all I kept thinking about was this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

adage like it is just too good to be true. Right? Everybody from the investors to the BitMEX trading people to Jeremy, had this kind of wishful thinking that even in the victim impact statements your Honor read there is kind of two themes, there is the victim saying here is the money I lost and here is the hypothetical possible amount of money I might have had if they had stayed in the market. Right? Even today there is this idea that crypto is going to solve everyone's financial problems and I think that's just not accurate.

Then, of course, the last thing I will say about the victim impact letters, I think it is absolutely incumbent upon me to point particularly to Exhibit 13, which is one of the letters provided by the government in which that victim said, very clearly, that he does not think that Jeremy should go to prison. He said -- and I will quote here, "I know that people make mistakes and sometimes cannot assess the implications of any actions in advance. The accused is, if I remember correctly, several years younger than me, just 22 years old at the time of the crime, and I would be ashamed if I did not believe in a second chance for the person concerned. I don't want a stranger to me on the other side of the globe to spend a big part of his life in prison." And that, of course, brings me to one of the mitigating factors I discussed in my letter which is Jeremy's age. And I'm not suggesting that he wasn't capable or competent of committing this crime. He did do so as

a fully-fledged legal adult and he has taken responsibility for that by pleading guilty, but as I wrote in my letter, we do know that adolescence, in terms of brain maturation, continues until the age of 25; that at the time Mr. Spence committed this crime at 21 years old there is a different — the part of your brain, the prefrontal cortex that has the long-term judgment that can see long-term consequences is not fully developed. And I think that places him today, based on the lapse in time, in a different place not only in his life, in his family life, in his personal life, but in his neurological life. I think he is at a different phase as he stands here today.

And, you know --

THE COURT: Would you say the same thing about someone of the same age who walked into a bodega, put a gun to the head of the cashier, and blew his brains out?

MS. LEVINE: I think if they were below the age of 25 I would say that that person's immaturity, their brain immaturity contributed to their decision. That's not to say they shouldn't also be held accountable for their crime but are they the same as a clear-thinking adult? No.

And I think actually you see that because we don't see -- I don't see a lot of cases where my client is the youngest and kind of least sophisticated of the world that's around them. Right? We are often dealing with the person that is the most culpable, the person that should have known the

most better, and in this case that's really flipped on its head. And I think that we believe that people should mature with age. Big picture, I think the statistics of the Sentencing Commission bear that out and in particular in this case we know that some of his conduct just wreaks of how young he was and how silly he was and how naive he was.

But, having said that, I think Jeremy has some good qualities. I think he had some good qualities then and now and, frankly, he should have known better. Just because he is naive or gotten in over his head is not an excuse for exercising poor judgment, it is just a piece of the puzzle.

I think that as your Honor sits here and evaluates the 3553(a) factors together, one thing the Court can think about is Jeremy's potential for the future. He is a smart kid, there is no question that he has intellect. I think that is well-documented. He has just a handful of semesters between him and a bachelors degree. He is eager to go back to college, he wants to study science. He wants to have nothing do with finances or economics, really, ever again. He wants to work. He is a person who knows how to work. He was a busboy starting at age 14. He appreciates the value of a dollar and he is going to go back to work, he is going to work I think for most of his adult life to pay off the victims in this case.

Now, the government suggested in their letter that because we pointed out the fact that Jeremy is middle class

that we are asking for some kind of middle class sentence and that is, of course, not the case. We are doing what 3553(a) demands which is to say that Jeremy is lucky to have some structures and some support in place that will help him going forward.

He has a safe place to live. He has people who love him. He has skills that will make him employable in the future. He has a college degree that will make him further employable in the future. These are the kinds of things that can give the Court confidence that he can get back on track.

And there is no factor I think more relevant to that analysis than his parents. His parents are sitting in the front row next to his twin sister. They came here with him today. They all drove together from Rhode Island. And in the letters they wrote to you and that their extended family wrote to you there is simply no question that they love him, that they've watched him throughout this prosecution and the civil cases that came before it. They have seen how stressed and embarrassed and ashamed he is and I think that their hearts break for this ambitious kid who really, really, really screwed up. And despite appreciating and knowing and fully understanding how badly he screwed up — which he did — they're absolutely certain that he is going to get back on track, that he can do that, and he will literally do so under their watchful eyes. He lives in their house, they are

financially supporting him.

And then last, the last mitigating factor that I have to talk about, of course, is Jeremy's current medical crisis and perhaps I should have started with this rather than ended with it because I will tell you that of all the things I'm talking about today, this is the one that Jeremy and his family are the absolute most concerned about and that is his need to get treatment for his recent cancer diagnosis. That's the absolute most important thing on his mind and the mind of his family.

Your Honor already knows that in March Jeremy had tests followed by emergency surgery to remove what turned out to be testicular cancer. They found a germ cell tumor. They tested it. It was malignant. And a cancer diagnosis is a lot for anyone, but it is particularly so for an otherwise healthy 25-year-old.

He is lucky to be receiving very good medical care and cancer like this, as I understand it, has a good prognosis if you get the right treatment and if you stay vigilant and that's what he has been doing. He has been having regular scans, he has been going back to the oncologist, he has been going back to the surgeon, he has been going back to the urologist because that's how you monitor if the cancer has spread or if it comes back. And I wrote to your Honor earlier this week that just this last Friday, based on a review of the most recent CT

scans, the oncologist said that Jeremy needs chemotherapy and that round of chemo therapy is scheduled to begin on May 23rd, which is in, of course, about 12 days.

THE COURT: What is the duration of the planned course?

MS. LEVINE: Yes, your Honor. It is scheduled for what they call a 21-day cycle.

As I understand it from reading his medical records, because of the side effects of chemo and monitoring his progress, they would want at least two months following that to see if it worked. And so, in the event the Court is contemplating a jail sentence, we would ask for a surrender date of no earlier than September 1.

THE COURT: Is there any detectable evidence of spread outside the portion of his anatomy that was removed?

MS. LEVINE: So as I understand it there was some kind of notation on the most recent scan that was part of the recommendation to now do chemo. We weren't sure that he was going to need chemo and that was a more recent decision based on a more recent scan.

Now, look. I think his prognosis overall is good.

THE COURT: That I understand but my question was a very specific one.

MS. LEVINE: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: It was: Are you in a position to tell me

today whether there is any evidence of any spread outside the portion of his anatomy that was removed surgically?

MS. LEVINE: So I will read from the medical record that was faxed to me on Friday that said — this is a quote — note made of CT scan results which showed presence of small pulmonary nodules. Cannot rule out disease involvement but seems unlikely given normal tumor markers. Will need to be re-assessed on subsequent imaging.

THE COURT: OK. So that says conceivable, unlikely.

MS. LEVINE: That's right.

THE COURT: But indeterminate.

MS. LEVINE: Correct. And then what follows is the recommendation for chemo.

THE COURT: OK. I understand that.

MS. LEVINE: Yes.

And, of course, there is a short-term plan of action which I just described to your Honor. But, in terms of long-term management, these are scans he is supposed to have every three months. I understand from his family at that yesterday's meeting with the urologist that if he were at liberty, they would expect him to come in every four months for at least the first year to get the same CT scans to make sure that nothing has changed. And your Honor certainly doesn't need me to tell you that the chances of that level of vigilance and maintenance are unavailable in the BOP. I think having

someone taken from an institution to get a scan is one of the absolute hardest things I have ever tried to effect for a client.

THE COURT: I believe that at Butner and one or two other places they can do it in the institution.

MS. LEVINE: So I think if he were designated to a medical center, that's correct, and I think otherwise we saw this in the middle of COVID, that all the specialists, the people who come in and do extra things, it was just paused indefinitely.

THE COURT: Yes, but --

MS. LEVINE: But hopefully they're back up and running. I don't know that information for sure but I guess this is how I would say it: If he is out in the community, we know with 100 percent certainty that he will get follow-up medical care, and in the BOP that becomes a lot grayer. And, of course, medical treatment is one of the 3553(a) factors that the Court is allowed to consider. And, in fact, I think people with ongoing medical crises that is often a particular reason for variance, that is a reason that is often used by Judges in this district.

And I promise I will sit down soon, I just have a couple more small things.

The first is the statute that Jeremy pled guilty to is a rarely used one in this district. I only know -- I was only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

able to locate one other case where someone pled to this specific statute and that is a case we cited in our papers,

U.S. V Thompson where that defendant was given a non-incarceratory sentence and supervision. We also cited to a number of cryptocurrency fraud cases where people who did kind of similar conduct were cases that were brought by the CFTC in a civil context and not even — there were no criminal charges whatsoever and therefore there were no criminal penalties.

And then I think I also have to briefly comment on the two cases that the government included in their sentencing letter where they cited to two cases where there were really substantial sentences for first-time offenders, it was in the range of 40-some-odd months. But Jeremy couldn't be more different than those defendants and I think the dissimilarities are clear. The first is they were far older and far more sophisticated than Jeremy. The defendant in Wells was 42. defendant in Schwartz was 73. The schemes went on for much longer. In Wells, the fraud took place over six years. And in Schwartz, I have to draw this distinction for your Honor: defendant pled quilty here in federal court, in 500 Pearl to federal fraud charges, and then he kept committing fraud. government postponed the sentencing so that the sentencing Court could address his ongoing illegal acts. He didn't learn his lesson, he wasn't deterred, he clearly didn't actually accept responsibility. And Ms. Magdo, in that case, advocated

for a substantial jail sentence. And I just think this case stands in stark contrast to someone like that. Your Honor knows cases like that. You have seen fraud cases like that. You have seen fraud defendants like that. And there is no reason to think -- your Honor is right that I can't prove he is not going to ever do anything bad ever again but there is absolutely no indication that he will. All of the things we look at --

THE COURT: I think you have covered that.

MS. LEVINE: Thank you.

And then the last thing I would say is the Court has 15 months of pretrial compliance to look at. It is that kind of compliance of acting with your, like, showing the Court what you can do, right? Not telling, not promising, but actually showing the Court. And as I mentioned briefly earlier, I do think there are a number of narrowly-tailored conditions that the probation office has at its disposal for financial crimes. One being approving lines of credit, a search condition regarding his financial condition, a work condition, a restitution condition, of course.

And, look. Jeremy has a ton of rebuilding to do. He has a long road ahead of him and he has taken the first steps on that road by pleading guilty, by expressing remorse. In his letter to the Court he talked about the relief he felt when the agents came and put him in handcuffs because the rubber was

finally meeting the road and he has lived with that for more than a year.

And so, your Honor, we submit that all of these factors together, under 3553(a), do balance in favor of a non-incarceratory sentence, with home detention, with community service, while he lives at home with his parents, while he slowly re-builds, while he finishes college, and gets medical help for the cancer that he is already battling.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Spence, you have a right to speak before you are sentenced. Is there anything you would like to say? If there is, you can go over to the lectern where Ms. Levine was.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, a few years ago I entered a world that I was completely unprepared for. I made many mistakes and I am sincerely mortified by my actions. I am deeply, deeply sorry to my family and the victims that were hurt because of me and I assure you that nothing like this will ever happen again. I am very sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Magdo?

MS. MAGDO: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed when you are ready.

MS. MAGDO: Thank you.

Your Honor, I would like to begin by briefly addressing a few points that Ms. Levine made in her address to

the Court that I think are -- they're a little bit of a red herring.

So the fact that Mr. Spence plead to the top count, which was commodities fraud, is really of no moment. The second count in the indictment was wire fraud. Commodities fraud is essentially a wire fraud that involves commodities and we try to charge — have someone plead to the charge that most accurately reflects the conduct.

With respect to the defendant's age and his health, those don't really put him outside the heartland of defendants. Unfortunately, as the Court is aware, we see so many people in their 20s appear before the Court in a range of cases.

With respect to his health the government, as we made clear in our submission, we don't oppose a delayed surrender date so that this can be taken care of but this is not expected to be a long-term, ongoing issue, and so many inmates that BOP has do have long-term issues that are dealt with. So, respectfully, I would say that the health issue can be dealt with and then a period of incarceration would be appropriate.

Not only is Mr. Spence not outside the range of a typical defendant, he is actually better off than most people who are in his seat. He had a loving and supportive family in a middle-class home. He had teachers who cared about him. He went to an elite private college. And although it's implied that his major -- philosophy -- didn't prepare him for trading

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cryptocurrency, I believe that people who study philosophy also study ethics and moral theory. And it was definitely something that, along the way, with all the advantages he had, he should have known better.

He was surrounded by -- or at least by two experienced people who considered him a friend and who did everything they could do try to help him. They went into a lot of detail on that so I won't belabor that point, but these were not all anonymous strangers to him. But, even if they were, that's not an excuse to lie, to cheat, to steal. Moreover, this was not a one-time slipup. It didn't last six years or 10 years, but this fraud lasted over a substantial period of time where Mr. Spence had many opportunities to come clean. And he chose not to. He didn't start this off as a non-profit for the benefit of the investors, he did this in order to also make money for himself. And he didn't lead a particularly lavish lifestyle, it is true, but that's because he was losing money from the get-go. He was just trying to plug the holes. He was soliciting investments at a point where he had already lost nearly all of the investor money and so that was because he could pay back the earlier investors. Those earlier investors were clamoring for their money back and he did not want to be discovered.

The things that Mr. Spence did in order to cover up the crimes really belie the claim that he is not a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sophisticated individual. He, throughout the scheme, provided fake returns to the administrators so that they could pass them on to the investors. Once the administrators got suspicious he, on two occasions, had a video of himself apparently logging into the account that contained the investor funds and he was able to have it display a fake balance that didn't actually exist. I am sure the FBI understands how he did that but I still don't understand how he did that.

And another thing that defense counsel mentioned is that the loss amount is too heavily emphasized in fraud cases in the sentencing quidelines. While I agree that might be true in certain cases where it is a victimless crime, it is a fraud on the market, it is some sort of an abstract loss. Here, the loss was not abstract. Every dollar that is in the loss amount came out of the pocket of an individual who was a parent, or a These were real hardships for real people. think your Honor can see that from the 15 letters that were submitted and the two individuals who came to speak here today. I can also represent that there were other victims who wanted to write to the Court but who did not want their identities revealed because of the shame and the embarrassment and the quilt that they felt having been victimized here. And that is consistent with what is in the letters that were written by the They talk about both the enormous economic impact that this crime had on them, they describe losing half, 80, 90,

or a hundred percent of their life savings. One individual was forced to sell his entire personal IRA 401K in order to just pay his living expenses. And perhaps, more profoundly, the victims repeatedly describe feelings of depression, anxiety, stress. They continue to suffer nightmares years after this happened. They themselves feel shame, humiliation, and they describe losing the trust of the people around them and losing confidence in themselves.

With respect to specific deterrence I am not alleging in any way that the defendant has committed any misconduct while he has been on supervised release, but the idea that during the time that he is on probation and then thereafter, when there is absolutely no supervision that the defendant couldn't go back and commit another crime like this, maybe he is not so inclined but whether practically he could do it, the answer to that seems pretty straightforward.

There are countless such scams and most of the perpetrators are never caught. This type of fraud will always exist whether it's a boiler room — and by this type of fraud I mean an individual soliciting others, mostly unknown to him, to give them money, perhaps with promises that should be perceived as too good to be true, but everything from boiler rooms to romance scams to the IRS impersonators. This type of fraud will always be with us, it will just change form.

Defense counsel also mentioned that the defendant has

suffered from the act of being arrested, the fact that he has had to be under pretrial supervision and live with his parents, that the media attention and the reputational harm that he suffered since being arrested but I think it's clear that those are not a defendant's punishment, those are effects and they are negative but those themselves are not punishment.

And I think really that's what I would like to end with, is that in this case, the need for both specific and general deterrence but also the need for just punishment. A non-custodial sentence would send an absolutely wrong message. It would be less than a slap on the wrist, it would be more like a gentle tap; it would be unfair and unjust to the over 100 victims who have lost not only financially but who have suffered emotionally. And, your Honor, I respectfully submit that a sentence with a substantial term of imprisonment is warranted here.

Does the Court have any questions?

THE COURT: No. Thank you.

Mr. Spence, please rise for the imposition of sentence.

Let me begin by making a couple of observations. I was struck in reading Ms. Levine's memorandum by a few things. I'm not going to mention all of them. She did a very good job. One thing I was struck by was the stupidity of the people you gulled into putting money with you. People invest in a

squiggly line? Give me a break. People send money to somebody identified on the Internet as Bruce Halftroll, or maybe Bruce Halftroll was the fellow sending the money? To describe this as the wild west does a substantial injustice to the wild west. That, at least, was kind of civilized if you didn't get shot.

Now that is not to diminish the harm that these people suffered at all. The victims in cases like this, they suffer in real terms. They have not only the fraudster to blame for it, in a lot of cases they have themselves to blame for it as well but that doesn't mean it is any less serious.

The other thing that really stood out was this sentence because it really spoke to me: Speaking of why you launched into the provision of false information and hiding the losses Ms. Levine wrote: "He believed that if people kept investing, he could make everyone whole."

The number of times that I have sentenced defendants of whom that could have been and was said in 27 and a half more or less years here, is astonishing. It astonishes even me and I was here for every one of them. You think Bernie Madoff thought that? I do.

I think it is an occupational hazard of people on Wall Street. People get started, they cut this corner, they cut that corner -- not all of them, of course. Pretty soon there is a problem. They start lying to cover the problem, start gypping people out of other money to try to pay to cover the

problem, and pretty soon the FBI is at the door. Over and over and over again, through my whole career on the bench, through my whole career as a lawyer, through everything I know about the financial markets in this country and similar economies and modern economic history, it is the never-ending story. But it is criminal and, Mr. Spence, I accept that you are a smart kid, and you were very well educated, and you had loving and moral and ethical parents and you knew -- you knew to a certainty when you started lying, when you started stealing from one to pay the other -- that it was wrong. There was no doubt in your mind.

You know, sometimes I see young defendants your age and younger who come out of far less privileged circumstances and who have been implicated in crimes where there was real wrong done but where, in some twisted way, you could get your mind around the concept that maybe they just thought that's the way you lived in their community. I can't say that about you. This was a serious crime. You committed it deliberately. You didn't do it once. You did it over and over again for months. You had a million opportunities to say, "wait a minute, I'm out of here, the time has come to go see my dad, get a lawyer, and fess up." Never happened. You didn't do it until you were caught.

Ms. Magdo struck, to my way of thinking, all the right notes. I am asked to take into account the 3553 factors. Of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

course I do, but they don't all cut your way. I'm obliged to impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the crime. You took people out of significant parts of their life savings. You made their lives and their emotional health far worse than it should have been. What is the right answer to reflect a just punishment for that and the seriousness of the crime? refer also to just punishment. I'm very sympathetic about your medical condition. We will talk about that in a moment. a terrible thing. I hope the prognosis is as good as I have been led to believe it is. I genuinely do. But to have you walk out of here after what you did? I don't see it. Moreover, I have to consider imposing a sentence that others in the financial community, either the real one -- I shouldn't say the real one because I am behind the times -- even the one I grew up with on Wall Street without this electronic never-never land, that there are real life consequences to these kind of shenanigans and they are serious and if they get caught, they're going to pay a serious price. And that's independent of whether I believe you are ever going to do anything like this again. Whether you will, I really don't know. some times when I come to sentence a defendant where it is reasonably clear to me that the chances of recurring wrongdoing are minimal. I'm told that's true in your case. I understand you behaved yourself, as far as anybody knows, on pretrial But I don't really know that and I don't know whether

that's because there is real remorse and you have learned your lesson, or whether it is because you understand that getting caught engaging in shenanigans during this period is about the worst thing you could possibly do. But that once the sword of Damocles is no longer hanging over your neck, maybe there is a relapse. I just don't know. I am undecided in my mind about that, I don't have enough information.

The one thing that I am inclined to agree with in terms of a factor arguing for a lower than guideline sentence, is that I, too, am critical about the focus on the loss amount in the table that appears in the guidelines and plays what is often a disproportionate amount, a disproportionate role in determining a sentence in an economic crime like this. I have commented about that previously in sentencing. I understand it has no real empirical basis, it is just what some committee negotiated and so I don't attach too much weight to it.

So, in the last analysis I am going to impose a sentence somewhat the below the sentencing guidelines but I do it principally on the basis of my concerns about the importance, in the guideline computation, of the loss amount, and I am trying to achieve the objectives of the Sentencing Reform Act to which I adverted.

It is the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States, or his designee, for a term of imprisonment of 42 months; that you

thereafter serve a term of supervised release of three years; and that you pay the mandatory special assessment of \$100.

It is further adjudged that you pay restitution in the amount of \$2,847,743 as is more fully set forth and on the terms more fully set forth in the consent order of restitution that I am signing here this afternoon.

The term of supervised release will be subject to the mandatory, the standard, and the special conditions of supervision set forth at page 21 through 23 of the presentence report which you have testified you have read completely.

Does either counsel feel it necessary for me to read those conditions in haec verba?

MS. MAGDO: Not from the government, your Honor.

MS. LEVINE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, I advise you that to whatever extent you haven't waived it, you have the right to appeal from the judgment imposing this sentence. If you wish to appeal, you must file a written notice of appeal not later than 14 days after the date on which judgment is entered, which would probably be tomorrow. If you wish to appeal and you can't afford to pay the fees necessary to do so, you have the right to move for permission to appeal as a poor person. If you make such a motion and it were granted, you would be permitted to appeal without payment of the fees, and if you couldn't afford a lawyer, a lawyer

would be appointed for you at government expense.

You may be seated.

I do want to say to Mr. and Mrs. Spence, there is no joy in doing this -- and to your sister -- there is no joy in doing this. This is a duty that just, unfortunately, falls to us. And I know it will be hard on the family and that happens, regrettably, almost every time somebody commits a serious crime and winds up being sentenced for it. It is the fault of the offender and not anybody else.

Now, I am receptive to delaying the surrender because I want Mr. Spence to have the medical condition properly tended to and I do not have excessive confidence in the medical care in the Bureau of Prisons through a great deal of experience over the years with people over whom I have had jurisdiction.

I am inclined to set a surrender date in the middle to latter part of September to err on the side of too much opportunity for treatment rather than too little. So absent objection, I will continue the defendant on bail on the condition that he surrender to the Bureau of Prisons for the service of his sentence at the institution designated by it for that purpose on the date and by the time specified by the Bureau of Prisons which shall not be earlier than September 19th. Compliance with that requirement is required because I am ordering you to comply with it and because I am making it a further condition of your bail. If, for any reason, you don't

comply, you could be prosecuted for contempt of Court and for escape, both of which could be serious additional matters leading, perhaps, to additional penalties.

Now, I am going to require that by September 12th, unless the defendant has been designated to surrender on or after the 19th and the defendant intends to do so without an extension, the following: I would consider, on medical grounds, a possible postponement of the surrender date if the defense thinks it is medically necessary or appropriate. But I'm not an easy person on this and what I would want to have by September 12th, if the defendant is going to make such a request, is complete information on the status of the cancer including staging, the radiological reports, the pathology reports, and the proposed treatment plan. I'm not an uninformed consumer of such things, regrettably not for any personal reason. And if I have questions, of course, you will hear about them.

Anything else?

MS. MAGDO: Your Honor, the government moves to dismiss the open count in the indictment.

THE COURT: Granted.

MS. LEVINE: Your Honor, may I have one moment with my client?

THE COURT: Yes. Sure.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. LEVINE: Thank you.

Your Honor, just briefly. First is we would ask that the Court, just with regard to designation, we would ask for a recommendation that Mr. Spence serve his prison term as close to Rhode Island, which is his address, to facilitate family visits.

THE COURT: Look. I will consider that in September and the reason I am putting it off is if the circumstances warrant, I would recommend a medical facility, and that might be inconsistent. Now, I suspect it isn't because I think FMC Devens is right there, it is right close to Rhode Island, but I'm not sure whether that would be the best place for him if there is really a medical situation. So if you want to renew that request in September, do so.

MS. LEVINE: Right. That's exactly what --

MR. KELLY: May we confer briefly?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Counsel conferring)

MS. LEVINE: So your Honor, we are having an internal conversation about exactly what your Honor just addressed, which is I think it is premature for us to know if we would be requesting a medical center because it is going to depend a lot on how things progress.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. LEVINE: And I -- my colleague suggests that we

```
ask the Court that today's judgment, the current judgment say
1
2
      designated near Rhode Island, and in the event that he need no
3
      further medical care when he reaches the BOP, the judgment
      would lie as is. And in the event that the future developments
 4
5
     with regard to his medical care --
6
               THE COURT: We can amend the judgment.
 7
               MS. LEVINE: -- we can amend the judgment at that
8
     point.
9
               THE COURT: That's OK.
10
               MS. LEVINE: Thank you. Nothing further, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Anything further?
12
               MS. MAGDO: No. Thank you, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you, all.
14
                                    000
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```